

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed January 11, 2008, claims 1-3 were rejected. Additionally, claims 4-7 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, the drawings were objected to. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are amended. Claim 4 is canceled. No claims are added.

For reference, claims 1, 2, and 5 are amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite a third and fourth pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled respectively to third and fourth multiplexors. Claim 5 is amended merely to designate dependence to claim 1. These amendments are supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the original specification in the abstract as well as claims 2 and 4.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determination that claims 4-7 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 4-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action states that Figure 4 should include a legend to designate the illustrated subject matter as prior art. However, Applicants note that the current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The drawing requirements for U.S. National Stage applications are identified in MPEP 1825 and labeling of figures as "Prior Art" is not required (see PCT Rule 11.11). Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that "[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11)." In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that labeling Figure 1 as "Prior Art" is not required in the current application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser (U.S. Pat. No. 6,853,696, hereinafter Moser) in view of Savoj (Design of Half-Rate Clock and Data Recovery Circuits for Optical Communication Systems, hereinafter Savoj), further in view of Yoon (Digital Logic Implementation of the Quadricorrelators for Frequency Detector, hereinafter Yoon). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Moser, Savoj, and Yoon for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites “a third pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled to a third multiplexer supplied by the first signal,” and “a fourth pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled to a fourth multiplexer supplied by the second signal” (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that the combination of Moser, Savoj, and Yoon does not teach a third and fourth pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits, as recited in the claim. The Office Action concedes that the Moser does not teach 1) the use of double edge clocked bi-stable circuits; and 2) the use of a balanced quadricorrelator. Office Action, page 3. The Office Action relies on Savoj to teach the use of double edge clocked bi-stable circuits. However, although Savoj may teach the use of double-edge-triggered flip-flops (Savoj, Fig. 11, section 3.2.2), Savoj fails to teach a third and fourth pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled respectively to third and fourth multiplexors. In fact, Savoj appears to be silent in regard to a third and fourth pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled respectively to third and fourth multiplexors. Additionally, the Office Action does not assert that Moser or Yoon might teach the missing limitation of Savoj. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentable over Moser, Savoj, and Yoon because Savoj does not teach “a third pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled to a third multiplexer supplied by the first signal,” and “a fourth pair of double edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled to a fourth multiplexer supplied by the second signal,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Moser, Savoj, and Yoon fails to teach all of the limitations of the claim because Savoj does not teach a third and fourth pair of double

edge clock bi-stable circuits coupled respectively to third and fourth multiplexors. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Moser, Savoj, and Yoon because the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2, 3 and 5-7 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2, 3 and 5-7 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2, 3 and 5-7 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. Petition is hereby made under 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the time for response to the Office Action of December 4, 2007 to and through January 4, 2008, comprising an extension of the shortened statutory period of one month. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Holman/

Jeffrey T. Holman
Reg. No. 51,812

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111

Date: May 12, 2008